11		ı
1		1
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT	
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
4	Case No. 12-12020-mg	
5	x	
6	In the Matter of:	
7		
8	RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, et al.,	
9		
10	Debtors.	
11		
12	x	
13		
14	United States Bankruptcy Court	
15	One Bowling Green	
16	New York, New York	
17		
18	August 1, 2012	
19	4:02 PM	
20		
21	BEFORE:	
22	HON. MARTIN GLENN	
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE	
24		
25		
	eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net	

(Doc#90,47) Adj. Telephone Status Conference on the Record, Re: Motion Authorizing the Debtors to Continue to Perform Under the Ally Bank Servicing Agreements in the Ordinary Course of Business. Transcribed by: Penina Wolicki eScribers, LLC 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040 (973)406-2250 operations@escribers.net eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

			3		
1					
2	APP	APPEARANCES: (TELEPHONICALLY)			
3	MORRI	MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP			
4		Attorneys for Debtors			
5		1290 Avenue of the Americas			
6		New York, NY 10104			
7					
8	BY:	STEFAN W. ENGELHARDT, ESQ.			
9		TODD GOREN, ESQ.			
10		GARY S. LEE, ESQ.			
11					
12					
13	MORRI	SON & FOERSTER LLP			
14		Attorneys for Debtors			
15		755 Page Mill Road			
16		Palo Alto, CA 94304			
17					
18	BY:	DARRYL P. RAINS, ESQ.			
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25					
		eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net			

	4			
1				
2	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP			
3	Attorneys for Ally Financial Inc. & Ally Bank			
4	601 Lexington Avenue			
5	New York, NY 10022			
6				
7	BY: RAY C. SCHROCK, ESQ.			
8				
9				
10	KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP			
11	Attorneys for Ally Financial Inc. & Ally Bank			
12	555 California Street			
13	San Francisco, CA 94104			
14				
15	BY: MARK E. MCKANE, ESQ.			
16				
17				
18	KRAMER LEVIN NAFTALIS & FRANKEL LLP			
19	Attorneys for Official Creditors' Committee			
20	1177 Avenue of the Americas			
21	New York, NY 10036			
22				
23	BY: KENNETH H. ECKSTEIN, ESQ.			
24	BRADLEY O'NEILL, ESQ.			
25				
	eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net			

			5
1			
2	CHADE	OURNE & PARKE, LLP	
3		Attorneys for Examiner, Arthur J. Gonzalez	
4		30 Rockefeller Plaza	
5		New York, NY 10112	
6			
7	BY:	ROBERT GAYDA, ESQ.	
8		DAVID LEMAY, ESQ.	
9		HOWARD SEIFE, ESQ.	
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
		eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net	

### RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 6 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: On behalf of the debtor, Mr. Lee and Mr. 3 Rains. Is that right? 4 MR. LEE: That's correct, Your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. McKane and Mr. Schrock? 6 MR. MCKANE: Yes. That's correct, Your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Seife, that's for the examiner, anybody else? 8 9 All right. Why don't we begin? 10 MR. LEE: That's very good. Your Honor? 11 THE COURT: Yes? 12 MR. LEE: I apologize. So this is Gary Lee on behalf 13 of the debtors. Your Honor, we wanted to give you a report on 14 discovery. And I'm going to turn it over to my partner, Darryl 15 Rains, who's going to be trying the case if we get there, to 16 report. 17 At the end, Your Honor, we'd like to reserve some time to raise an issue that's come up with respect to the motion 18 19 that's before Your Honor, as well as the fact that it covers in 20 sum and substance, the subject of Your Honor's examination 21 order. We've had a discussion with the examiner, and he has 22 asked to address Your Honor at the end of the discussion on 23 discovery and timing and schedule. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. LEE: Okay. So if I may, Your Honor, may I turn eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 7 1 it over to Mr. Rains? 2 THE COURT: You certainly may. 3 MR. LEE: Thank you, sir. 4 MR. RAINS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 5 Darryl Rains from Morrison & Foerster. Let me give you a quick 6 report on discovery from the debtors' point of view. 7 First, I'm happy to report that we produced virtually all of our documents on Monday. There are a few stragglers 8 9 that we're getting out today. There are also a few issues that 10 have arisen today, questions that we've gotten from the creditors' committee. But we still expect to have completed 11 12 our document production by today. 13 Let me also just update you on deposition scheduling. 14 We have four witnesses who we intend to submit direct testimony 15 for. And they are scheduled for deposition beginning on 16 Friday. We have the CFO, Mr. Whitlinger on Friday; then Senior 17 Vice President of Servicing Matt Detwiler, on Monday; the CEO, 18 Tom Marano, on Tuesday; and then we'll be offering up Joe 19 Pensabene, who's executive vice president. He's available on 20 Wednesday. 21 So we think we have complied with the Court's prior 22 orders and that we've been quick and diligent in getting our 23 documents and our witnesses scheduled. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, this is Mark McKane on behalf eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

of AFI and Ally Bank. I'd like to give you an update as well.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. McKane. Go ahead.

MR. MCKANE: Thank you, sir. We also have satisfied our obligations in response to the committee's request, which we just received last Monday, eight and a half days ago. We've made a targeted production of all the materials on the issues that they wanted us to focus on, the five core topics. And we completed that production today. Importantly, the core materials that we believe would be those most likely to be used in a deposition or in a hearing were produced by yesterday.

We have two witnesses that we are going to be presenting direct testimony for at trial. The first is going to be the bank's CEO, Barbara Yastine, and she is available for a deposition on Friday. And then on Monday, we are making available Jim Mackey, who is the CFO of AFI.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, this is Brad O'Neill on behalf of the committee. We have a few issues on documents and on depositions. First, we did receive from the debtors on Monday about 68,000 pages of documents. We are working through those. We've received a number of installments from AFI, about 40,000 pages at the end of last week, plus, I think 1,000 yesterday and another 13,000 about an hour ago. And we're working through that.

There is one area of -- there's one gap, as we eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

understand it, in the Ally-AFI production. And that is that we don't have e-mails from some critical people, including Ms.

Yastine, who they're proposing as a witness, and also, some senior executives of Ally -- of AFI, rather. And let me give you an example.

We received from the debtors a copy of an e-mail from Tom Marano, who's the CEO of ResCap, dated two days before the petition date, to Michael Carpenter, the CEO of AFI, and Jeff Brown, who is, I believe, his second-in-command, saying that --describing essentially the modification in reimbursement process under the subservicing agreement, indicating that the pull-through rate is higher than expected, two times higher than expected, and that as a result, indemnification payments could be 70 to 120 million dollars higher than expected or projected, and suggesting that AFI agree to reimburse ResCap for that increased cost.

We do not have -- and my understanding is we will not receive as part of this production, or at least AFI has not undertaken to produce -- Mr. Carpenter's or Mr. Brown's e-mails. It seems to us, however, that there was a very high-level discussion, at the upper reaches of both companies concerning matters that are central to this motion and central to Your Honor's consideration of the subservicing agreement. And we think, frankly, we need the e-mails.

And the same thing would be true for Ms. Yastine, who eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 10 1 is being proposed as the person most knowledgeable of issues 2 relating to Ally Bank. So that's point number one. 3 Point number two, on the scheduling of depositions, 4 Your Honor, what you've been told about the scheduling of 5 depositions, is the schedule proposed by the debtors and Ally 6 Bank and AFI. We are working through the document productions. 7 I think given that we got 13,000 pages of documents today from 8 Ally Bank, it's going to be extremely difficult for us to be 9 prepared to take a deposition on Friday morning. 10 Interestingly, Your Honor, they're proposing to produce the head of Ally Bank, whose office is in our building 11 on our elevator bank, out at Newark Airport. So while I 12 13 understand she's flying in from the West Coast, it's just an additional level of complication, and we would prefer to depose 14 15 both Ms. Yastine and Mr. Whitlinger next week. And we have 16 made -- we have people available. We're ready to do it Monday, 17 Tuesday, or Wednesday. And we have sufficient attorneys 18 available to do it on a triple-track basis, if necessary. 19 MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, this is Mark McKane. May I 20 respond directly? 21 THE COURT: Let me see whether anybody else wants to 22 be heard first. 23 Go ahead, Mr. McKane. 24 MR. MCKANE: Thank you, sir. Your Honor, we, unlike

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

the debtor, whose motion this is, we did not receive these

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC. ET AL.

discovery requests six weeks ago. We received this request eight and a half days ago. We immediately had a call the following morning, Tuesday; identified targeted searches; and proceeded and conducted those searches.

The materials that they want us to focus on were five agreements: the servicing agreement, the 2010 indemnity agreement; the January 30th support agreement; the DOJ-AG settlement agreement; and the resizing of the AFI DIP. That's not my identification of the topics. That's the committee's before our call on Thursday.

We proceeded forward focusing on those materials. We produced the following categories of materials: board minutes, presentations to the board, final versions of the agreements, draft versions of the agreements, e-mails relating to those negotiations, and calendar notices about the meetings and the back-and-forths. We had to do it on a targeted basis, focusing on the key negotiators, including Ms. Yastine, who was the lead negotiator in this case, who handled it personally against Tom Marano, over series of months. And so those are materials that have been produced. And they do include e-mails.

Moreover, as it relates to the targeted materials that would be related to the matter, we have produced those. If there's anything that they're having difficulty identifying, we have offered to identify it by Bates number. For example, when I spoke to Mr. O'Brien (sic) a few hours ago, he specifically

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

asked about bids that related to whether the pricing of the servicing agreement vis-a-vis the marketplace, I specifically identified and directed him to the April 25th presentation to the Ally Bank and offered him the Bates number for that, if he

5 wanted it.

And as it relates to Ms. Yastine's availability, she is currently en route to the West Coast for Ally business. We met with her this morning. She is returning from the West Coast on the redeye on Friday. She asked to meet at the airport. We flagged this issue as soon as we were aware of it, and made the accommodations available for it occur, because immediately after the deposition, she is taking a week off, not just for vacation, but to handle a very personal matter as it relates to her mother.

So she is not in the office next week. We recognize that she's an important witness. But we have made every offer to identify the core materials, and importantly, the key materials that will be relevant and necessary for any examination of Ms. Yastine were produced by yesterday. And we made efforts -- specific efforts to do so. And we by stand by the offer. If --

THE COURT: Wait, wait. Time out. Stop. You don't get to unilaterally decide what the committee believes is important for the deposition. So that's number one. That's not a unilateral decision on your part. If you produced 13,000

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 13 pages today and you're expecting them to take an important deposition on Friday, it just isn't going to work that way. Okay? You all have to realize, I'm not driving this schedule for this early hearing; you all are. If you want this hearing, then you're all going to have to jump through enormous hurdles to produce everything. Mr. O'Neill, what are the additional e-mails that you have requested? MR. O'NEILL: Well, we requested documents defined to include electronic communications, documents concerning, among other things, the subservicing agreement, and the indemnification obligations. And I can't tell you what they haven't given me. I haven't looked at the 13,000 pages. understanding, based on communications between my team and Mr. McKane's team, is that we're not going to be getting a substantial production of e-mails. And my understanding was we're not getting Ms. Yastine's e-mails. And I don't expect to get Mr. Carpenter's or Mr. Brown's e-mails. My point in bringing this --THE COURT: This --MR. O'NEILL: -- one e-mail is --THE COURT: Mr. O'Neill, please stop there. MR. O'NEILL: Sorry. THE COURT: The difficulty with telephone hearings is eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 14 sometimes when somebody's speaking, it's hard to hear when the judge is interrupting. Mr. McKane, do they have Ms. Yastine's e-mails? If not, when are they going to get them? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, we went through and did a targeted search for e-mails relating to the negotiations and the back-and-forth, as relates to the servicing agreement, the core issue in the case. We did that -- they -- as it relates to electronic discovery, you have to understand that we only received the request eight and half days ago, and we never even got to where the committee proposed search terms as it relates to her e-mail. THE COURT: Mr. McKane, Mr. McKane, just listen carefully to me. Okay? I don't want to hear a long speech about when they gave you the search terms and what you did. They're saying that there -- has there been a -- I'm going to ask this question, and I want a direct answer to it. Has there been a search for Ms. Yastine's e-mails; yes or no? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, we did -- we have collected her e-mail, and we specifically looked for e-mail regarding the negotiations themselves. That was the scope of the negotiations. And we produced those communications and the meeting, calendar notices for the negotiations with Mr. Marano. THE COURT: Have you searched for Mr. Carpenter's e-mails? MR. MCKANE: No, Your Honor, we have not been able to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 15 conduct that search yet, because -- and this is an issue as it relates to our ability to do collection on this timetable. had already collected Ms. Yastine's e-mail in response to the 2004. We do not have -- we did not have Mr. Carpenter's e-mail harvested as of Tuesday to be able to conduct that parallel search. THE COURT: When will you be able to do that? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, I don't have the input from our technical team to be able to give you that answer. THE COURT: Mr. O'Neill, Mr. McKane is saying that there has been a search for Ms. Yastine's e-mails. What is that you say they haven't searched for? MR. O'NEILL: I am told by my team that we may have a handful of e-mails from Ms. Yastine, and that's it. have expected more. MR. MCKANE: Your Honor --MR. O'NEILL: I can't tell you what's not there. THE COURT: Don't interrupt. MR. MCKANE: Mr. Carpenter --THE COURT: When he's finished, I'll give you a chance. Go ahead, Mr. O'Neill. MR. O'NEILL: I have concluded, Your Honor. THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. McKane. MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, as it relates to Mr. eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 16 1 Carpenter, I don't want there to be a misconception. 2 counterparty to the servicing agreement is Ally Bank. Ally 3 Bank were the people who were negotiating. And it was 4 specifically Ms. Yastine who was the lead negotiator. 5 Obviously they're -- the committee wants to raise issues as it 6 relates to guarantee or other obligations as it relates to AFI, 7 and we're putting forward a witness on that, Mr. Mackey. THE COURT: Well --8 9 MR. MCKANE: But if the core issue in the case is the 10 integrated subservicing agreement and reimbursement obligations of the debtor for the use of Ally Bank's assets, the proper 11 12 witness and the proper party is Ms. Yastine. 13 MR. O'NEILL: For Ally Bank, that may be true, Your 14 Honor. But AFI had an indemnification obligation itself and --15 which was recognized by both parties. And immediately pre-16 petition, the CEOs of AFI and ResCap were discussing how and 17 whether AFI would reimburse ResCap for indemnification 18 obligations under the subservicing agreement. 19 THE COURT: That's Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Brown? 20 MR. O'NEILL: Yes. 21 THE COURT: Okay. You know, Mr. McKane, you may be 22 putting up -- you may be offering the Yastine and Mackey 23 declarations as your affirmative evidence, but that doesn't say -- that doesn't mean that the committee can't take the 24 25 depositions or obtain the discovery of Carpenter and Brown eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

## RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

documents.

They've represented that they've seen e-mails that show a discussion between them or communications between them that would show that the indemnity obligation could rise as high as 70 to 120 million dollars. That, from what I know about this dispute, is directly relevant to the dispute. So the fact --

MR. MCKANE: Your Honor --

THE COURT: -- you know, on this accelerated timetable, you're saying that at this stage, at least, no search for Carpenter -- what about Brown? Has a search been made of him?

MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, I believe we're in the same situation with Mr. Brown as we are with Mr. Carpenter. We're not trying to unilaterally limit the scope of the collection efforts to narrow the committee's examination. We have produced material as it relates to the indemnification obligations that pre-dated the subservicing agreement. We produced the requested indemnification as it related to it, and the back-and-forth on it.

THE COURT: Are you suggesting it's not relevant to this dispute if Carpenter and Brown communicate with each other and indicate that the amount of the indemnity obligation may increase to seventy to a hundred million dollars? Is it your position that's not relevant to this dispute?

# RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

MR. MCKANE: No, Your Honor. But what I'm saying is that specific issue was negotiated between the debtor, Mr. Marano -- Mr. Marano, specifically, and Ms. Yastine. Based on our interviewing and working with the witnesses and preparing them for the deposition, we understand that that issue was identified by Mr. Marano to both Ally and Ally Bank, as the debtors were looking for additional financing support from AFI. But that specific issue was addressed at the Ally Bank level by Ms. Yastine, and Mr. Mackey was aware of it in providing what became the AFI DIP.

And materials about the AFI DIP have been provided; not just the actual agreements themselves, but the back-and-forth between the parties.

THE COURT: Mr. O'Neill, do you have a response to that?

MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, the date of this e-mail is after the signing of the amended and restated subservicing agreement. And it addresses issues -- it may well relate to the modification of the -- the post-petition modification of the AFI DIP. I don't know that. But that could easily be an outcome. It seems to me directly relevant to that topic, however. The issue is how are we going to pay for these increased indemnification obligations.

I think the way they wound up doing it was increasing the amount of the DIP. But my guess is there's an extensive

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 19 discussion between the date of this e-mail and the date of that modification.

MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, there was back-and-forth on this. It was primarily not by e-mail. But one of the outcomes of the need of the debtors for additional liquidity as it related to their missed forecast on these reimbursement obligations, was the AFI DIP. It was a requested issue in the discovery, and we collected and produced material on it.

THE COURT: Tell me again, Mr. McKane, what Ms. Yastine's schedule is.

MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, look, it is undeniably regrettable. She is returning on the redeye to Newark at 7 a.m. on Friday. She is going -- she asked and we made an accommodation so that the deposition would start at 10 o'clock on Friday. She'll go as long as it takes on Friday to answer any questions on any of these issues. She then is planning on a pre-existing leave of absence for a week to deal with a personal matter as relates to her mother and then spend the remainder of the week with her family out-of-state. But she does not return -- and I recognize that -- she does not return until after the briefs are due.

THE COURT: Returning to California on Friday?

MR. MCKANE: That's correct, Your Honor. She's -- we met with her this morning. And all I -- I wasn't trying to streamline or focus. I just know what materials we used with

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. off, that's fine with me. I'm not the one pushing this hearing.

AFI is the one who insists that this hearing go forward and that a decision be reached promptly, okay? If you want to insist on that, then you're going to have to do everything conceivable to provide the committee with all the discovery it requests. Otherwise, I'm just simply going to adjourn the hearing. It's as simple as that. Okay. I don't want to hear about these problems. Just throw another ten or twenty people on and get the Carpenter and Brown documents and any other e-mails that they want.

e-mails that weren't searched for and found, okay, there are going to be consequences. Okay? I didn't set this schedule. You're the one -- it's AFI that's the one that's driving this train. Okay? If you want to insist on that, then you have to do everything conceivably possible to get the committee everything it needs so that it can be prepared to go forward with a hearing on August 16 and 17. It's as simple as that.

MR. MCKANE: Your Honor --

THE COURT: I don't want to hear what your problems are.

MR. MCKANE: We're not identifying problems. We're not, Your Honor. We just -- we're trying to identify the situation.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

# RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 22 THE COURT: Well, that's all I hear from you is about how you've done this and how you've done that, and they have to go forward on Friday when you produced 13,000 documents today. Okay? You know, I feel for Ms. Yastine about her vacation; and if she has family issues, that'll take a priority. she's got a vacation, she may have to put the vacation off. The deposition can start on Friday. If it's not concluded because the committee has not had an opportunity to review all the documents or they have more questions, she can go make the trip for family business, but she's going to have to interrupt her vacation. It's as simple as that. Okay? Regrettable, I understand. But look, unless you want to agree to adjourn the hearing now. You're representing AFI. Do you want to agree to adjourn the hearing? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, I'm not in a position to make that offer. THE COURT: Okay. MR. MCKANE: I'm not. THE COURT: And if you're not in the position to make that offer, then I am ordering that Ms. Yastine be made available for deposition starting Friday morning. deposition's not concluded, it will -- when does her vacation start? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, she was planning to address the personal issue with her mother when the deposition ceased. eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 23 1 That's why she asked for it to be in New Jersey. 2 THE COURT: No, I didn't ask about -- yeah, but then 3 you said she was going on vacation for a week. 4 MR. MCKANE: That's correct. I don't know -- I'm --5 THE COURT: We'll not interfere with her dealing 6 with --7 MR. MCKANE: I don't know exactly how many days it's I don't want to get into what the issue is with 8 going to take. 9 her mother. 10 THE COURT: You report back to Mr. O'Neill by tomorrow morning at 10, on exactly what Ms. Yastine's situation is. 11 12 she needs to deal with health issues about her mother, she 13 definitely has to do that. But vacation is going to have to be 14 interrupted. If they're able to complete the deposition on 15 Friday, that's fine. 16 Mr. O'Neill, under the circumstances, take the 17 deposition at Newark Airport. I fully understand. If she's 18 coming in on the redeye for the deposition, and then she's 19 going immediately back on business and personal matters, do the 20 deposition at Newark Airport. But if you need more time with 21 the deponent, I'm ordering that that take place next week. 22 there are more problems, contact the Court, and I'll deal with 23 it. But I'll just tell you, Mr. McKane, if you want to get 24 25 your client to agree to adjourn the hearing to allow the eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 24 committee to take the discovery that it needs and get ready for the hearing, then we'll talk about a new hearing schedule. Short of that, you're going to have to do -- I regret that people will have to have their vacation interrupted, but that's just the way it's going to have to be. Personal business, health issues about her mother? Fine. Let her take care of that first. You indicated she was then planning to take a week's vacation. That's going to have to be interrupted. I understand -- I understand the message. MR. MCKANE: THE COURT: Mr. O'Neill, work that out with Mr. McKane by tomorrow morning. MR. O'NEILL: I will, Your Honor. I think the same situation, to some degree, applies to Mr. Whitlinger, who I understand is taking a vacation next week. I don't think he has the same health or family-related issues that Ms. Yastine I think we could agree to start that deposition on Friday as well, and if we don't finish it, we would ask -- we'll, I guess, deal with the debtors about how to get him back to conclude it next week. THE COURT: Okay, the same applies -- I'm sorry that this is in -- this is coming at a time where lots of people have vacations planned. Mr. Whitlinger was the first-day declarant. He's been present in court at other hearings. I

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

regret if his vacation is interrupted by this. But it's not

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 25 1 the committee that's driving the dates of this hearing. So, 2 you know, start the deposition. Hopefully you'll be able to 3 complete it and you won't have to take up the deposition. 4 Otherwise, do the best you can to accommodate these witnesses 5 so that they can take some of the time off that they were 6 intending to take. But you're entitled to conclude your 7 deposition. You're also entitled to be able to get documents 8 and prepare. 9 MR. O'NEILL: And on that note, Your Honor, we would 10 like the Brown and Carpenter e-mails. And depending on what they say, we may need to take their depositions as well. 11 12 THE COURT: After this call, discuss with Mr. McKane 13 and with Mr. Lee obtaining -- or Mr. Rains, obtaining the Brown 14 and Carpenter e-mails. And Mr. McKane, you're just going to 15 have to commit whatever resources are needed to get those 16 documents produced as quickly as possible. Okay? 17 MR. MCKANE: We understand the message, Your Honor. 18 We'll get it done. 19 MR. LEE: Your Honor, it's Gary Lee. Perhaps this 20 would be the appropriate time to address the issue that we've 21 been discussing with the examiner and see whether there's --22 how we address, now, this rather expanded motion practice and 23 trial and the way in which it's going to fit in with the I don't know if Mr. Seife is still on or if we've 24 examination. 25 scared him away based on this call.

#### RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

THE COURT: Mr. Seife?

MR. SEIFE: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Howard Seife, Chadbourne & Parke. Yes, we've had discussions both with committee counsel and with debtors' counsel about concerns we have based on, as Gary suggested, this upcoming trial. And certainly listening in on today's call, our issues are only heightened by what we're hearing.

And I guess they're really twofold, Your Honor. One is, which I think you noted at one of the prior conferences, many of the issues being dealt with here, both factual and legal, are what the examiner has been asked to look at. And clearly the parties have to be aware that to the extent these issues are aired now and Your Honor is being asked to rule on any of these legal issues or make factual findings, they may well have implications for the investigation, may limit the investigation, or put it in a different direction. And I'm just wondering if this is really the best procedure to get to the underlying facts and deal with the much bigger and broader issues which the examiner has been asked to look at.

And the second impact we're seeing on the investigation is that understandably, many of the key parties here are very much preoccupied. And they are busy producing documents and preparing witnesses and reviewing e-mails relating to this particular narrow issue. And frankly, it is difficult, I think, for the parties and the law firms involved

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

27

to focus on the needs of the examiner.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, understandably, this should be a fairly limited period of time, if in fact, the hearing goes forward on the 16th. But our concerns are, as often is the case, that -- and Your Honor has even alluded to that -- there is always the possibility for adjournments or new schedules, which would heighten our concerns about getting our investigation off to a robust start.

Those are the problems. The solution, I would not think is particularly the examiner's role. But in discussing these issues with the examiner, it seems, at least to an outsider, that this should lend itself to some kind of commercial resolution. The dollars don't seem to be, in the magnitude of this case, to be particularly overwhelming. And it seems to me that given the talent on this call and representing the various parties, there should be some way for parties to preserve their rights and find some kind of interim solution, whether it's escrowing the monies to be paid, whether it's finding some slicing of the baby or deferral of this issue to a later date after the examiner has issued his report, just would make so much commercial sense, rather than distracting the parties, taking up this Court's time, and putting up potential delays in the examiner's investigation.

So that said, Your Honor, I don't know to what extent the parties have been talking. But it seems to me, as an

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

outsider looking in, that some kind of commercial resolution would certainly address our concerns as an examiner to be able to look at these issues unimpeded by this potential sideshow and without the inherent delays that we're hearing about.

THE COURT: Mr. Eckstein, can you respond to that?

MR. ECKSTEIN: Your Honor, I'm happy to. I guess

first, I'm not sure I would necessarily share the view that

100-plus million dollars of post-petition payments are not

significant even in the context of this case. These are very

significant payments.

That said, I think as I had indicated, Your Honor, at the status conference the other day, we have been endeavoring over the last several weeks to avoid the litigation and find a resolution. And I share Mr. Seife's view that finding a way to really allow AFI and ResCap to sort of preserve their respective rights is a sensible thing to do. Unfortunately, Ms. Yastine of Ally Bank expects to get paid. And I think what it ultimately comes down to is finding a way for ResCap and AFI to come up with a, sort of, an interim solution that, to the extent possible, maintains the status quo because I don't believe that Ally Bank wants to participate in this process. And we, therefore, haven't suggested to Ally Bank to defer.

We are amenable -- we've been amenable and remain amenable to try to essentially find what Mr. Seife is referring to as an interim status quo solution that allows this to be

29 RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 1 folded into the examination. And toward that end, I'm anticipating and, frankly, hope that there's going to be more 2 discussions. But candidly, Your Honor, short of literally 3 4 negotiating this on this call, which I don't know that Your Honor necessarily is inviting, there needs to be a mutual 5 6 desire to try to reach that conclusion and that's what we, 7 frankly, need to have happen. Your Honor, it's --8 MR. LEE: 9 MR. SCHROCK: May I be heard, Gary? 10 I mean, Judge, it's up to you. MR. LEE: Sure. 11 wanted to just remark on a couple things --12 THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Lee, and then I'll give 13 somebody else a chance. 14 Go ahead, Mr. Lee. 15 So, Your Honor, I am obviously concerned MR. LEE: 16 about the impact this hearing is going to have not just on the 17 examination but on obviously the need to deliver on a 18 subservicing agreement. And Your Honor heard from the DOJ at 19 the last hearing. So we are facing this from lots of different 20 sides and none of them look good. So I have had discussions 21 with Mr. Seife and I believe this really cries out for a more 22 elegant and Solomonic resolution that leaves all of the parties 23 with their rights reserved. I think fundamentally, the bank needs to be paid. 24 25 seems to me, Your Honor, that there is a solution in which the

is or isn't a claim.

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

debtor continues to make the payments to the bank; the

committee reserves the right that I think it believes is

fundamental which is that if the agreement is approved, it will

impair its rights to argue later after the examination that the

indemnification obligation belonged to Ally and it impairs its

various rights. It seems to me, Your Honor, that it's

perfectly possible to fashion an order in which the debtor

continues to make the payments but without prejudice to the

investigation, the examiner's ability to look at the fair

allocation of indemnification obligations pre- and post
petition, and that preserves the parties' position and allows

the committee and everybody else, after they see the examiner's

That will allow the debtor to go about what we think is fundamentally important which is servicing pursuant to the servicing agreement and delivering a robust bidding process and sale. It will leave everybody where they are today, and it will leave the examiner to do what Your Honor's appointed the examiner to do. So I believe there is a solution. I don't believe it is as complicated as -- no more complicated than I expressed it.

report, to make an informed decision as to whether or not that

And just to sort of clarify one thing that Mr.

Eckstein has said, the sum total of post-petition payments to date is nineteen million dollars. This is definitely, Your

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 31 Honor, a hundred million dollar issue, but from a post-petition perspective, it's a nineteen million dollar issue. There are future payments to be made. We, and I think everybody, believes that the bank needs to get paid then by somebody. suggestion is that that is an appropriate outcome reserving all of these issues for another day. So I will stop there, Your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. MR. SCHROCK: Your Honor, it's Ray Schrock for Ally Bank. From the bank's perspective, and this is critically important, I think, for the Court to understand and for all the parties to understand, there is an agreement in front of the Court for the subservicing which everybody acknowledges is extremely important to the estate. There is a provision in that agreement that says if you use the bank's loans for DOJ modifications, you have to reimburse the bank for using its loans to fulfill those obligations. I completely appreciate everybody -- I think the right

I completely appreciate everybody -- I think the right solution is to allow the debtor to make those payments. If the parties want to reserve rights on that, I think that's fine. But it is critically important -- listen, this is a bank issue to the bank. The bank counterparty says ResCap, by law under Reg. W, you must fulfill, ResCap, your obligations which you agreed to with us. And we get in at the sideshow of these

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

indemnities and the DOJ order, and there are lots of issues associated with going into that, and it really is unnecessary.

But I sit here and I listen to this, Your Honor, about that Ally -- there's an implication that Ally or Ally Bank is being difficult. Your Honor, this company's bent over backwards to do the right thing here. We're willing to do the right thing and to continue to support the debtor, but it's not just a foot in the sand or a foot on the line to say that ResCap has to honor its obligations under the contract. It is critically important.

THE COURT: You know, Mr. Schrock, the one thing that I haven't heard people do is say that it's Ally Bank. It sounds like much more of an argument between AFI and the debtors.

MR. SCHROCK: But, Your Honor, this is a contract -THE COURT: Well, but I've also heard that the
indemnity was entered into in January or thereabouts.

MR. SCHROCK: Now, Your Honor, there is one agreement up for approval. There is a subservicing agreement before the Court. It says -- and ResCap signed it; it was highly negotiated -- it says ResCap, if you use our loans to modify, you, ResCap, will pay back. Now, if the examiner, if other parties want to go back and look and say listen, under this side agreement this or that, somebody owes somebody else, people should reserve rights on that. But this agreement, to

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

ask the bank to say listen, this agreement, we're not going to -- ResCap's not going to honor its obligations to pay back the bank for using its property to perform under a settlement to which it's not even a party and it's -- it is not something that we can settle.

MR. ECKSTEIN: Your Honor, if I may just briefly reply.

Mr. Schrock wears two hats here. And Your Honor correctly points out this is not a debate between ResCap and Ally Bank. Your Honor correctly points out the debate is about whether or not the responsibility is going to be allocated to ResCap, which has many obligations that it has not paid, or to AFI, which is jointly and severally obligated to indemnify Ally Bank. And that's what this is about. And I understand Mr. Schrock would like to mask this as a debate with Ally Bank, but it's not.

And this is about whether it's appropriate for one-hundred percent of the indemnification to be imposed on ResCap and zero on AFI. And for Mr. Lee to suggest that the right status quo is to have ResCap pay a hundred percent and we can chase AFI, that's a solution. Frankly, we had proposed a fifty-fifty split, and let both sides pay fifty percent in respect of the indemnification and let both sides reserve their rights after the examiner. The committee thought that was a reasonable compromise and we took --

# RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

THE COURT: Mr. Eckstein, have you explored -- and I don't want to get into negotiating, that's not my role. But let me just ask, you raised that you had a proposal about a fifty-fifty split. Have you discussed the possibility of a dollar cap on the ongoing -- on the periodic monthly obligations of the debtors?

If this issue -- on the one hand, Mr. O'Neill talks about having seen e-mails that say it could rise to sixty to a hundred million dollars, and Mr. Lee says post-petition it's been nineteen million dollars, on an interim basis can you try and agree with AFI -- because I -- it certainly was -- no one seems to be disputing that Ally Bank is entitled to payments; this dispute is between AFI and ResCap as to who ought to be paying and how much and when. If you can't get an agreement with respect to the percentage, have you explored whether you can reach an agreement as to a dollar cap per period?

MR. SCHROCK: Your Honor, I just have to -- it's Ray Schrock again. Just to make one thing --

THE COURT: The question was to Mr. Eckstein. I'll give you a chance, Mr. Schrock.

MR. SCHROCK: Okay.

MR. ECKSTEIN: Your Honor, we have proposed the fifty-fifty allocation of the indemnification obligations and we'd be happy to explore other variations. But there hasn't been anything beyond that.

## RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

THE COURT: And I'll give you a chance, Mr. Schrock, in just a minute, but from the Court's perspective, one of the things that I find least satisfying about the current situation is, here, an examiner's been appointed, this agreement, the indemnity obligation is very much an important issue for the examiner, and you're all charging ahead with an August trial that doesn't allow the examiner to do his job. Okay. And that's very disconcerting to me. This case is certainly -- you know, I haven't been at it as long as you all have been practicing bankruptcy law, but from -- and in talking to some of my colleagues, it's -- the things that are pushing this case are not the normal ones that we see in the court, okay? It doesn't make me particularly happy.

If I have to go ahead -- look, if you're going to go ahead and try it, fine. Go ahead and try and I'll decide what I have to. But I think this, in part, goes to AFI. If I go ahead and try the case and I decide issues and then the examiner completes his investigation and the facts turn out different than you present them, you're going to have a high cost to pay with me, I'll just tell you that right now.

I won't want to hear later on that, well, we didn't have time to find those documents, those documents that we discovered six months from now, they were -- everything was produced under pressure, we produced -- you're going to pay the price. I'll just tell you that right now. That's why I say

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 36 you insist on this schedule, you will insist -- I insist that there be absolute full document production, discovery so that this case goes to trial on August 16 and 17 with the committee having a full, fair opportunity to prepare. If there turn out to be surprises later, there will be a price to pay. want to make that clear, okay? If everything is done the way it has to be and you can't resolve this issue, I'll go ahead and decide what has to be decided. But I just want to make clear to you all there will be consequences. Okay? I don't like -- I've made this comment in open court and I've made it in our chambers conference before. I don't like anybody trying to drive the result here in a way that I don't think is appropriate. Okay? I understand all of you feel time pressure and we'll see how that all plays out. Mr. Schrock, you wanted to be heard.

MR. SCHROCK: I did. Thank you, Your Honor. I've heard and understood on your message.

One point I think that I just have to emphasize again for the Court and the parties: there is a fully integrated agreement before the Court and we -- as I said to Your Honor in open court last week on this matter -- we don't think getting into the DOJ, the indemnification issues, all of these things, is necessary or appropriate on this particular issue because we believe there is a fully integrated agreement and it's important to the bank that the counterparty to that agreement

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

37 honors its obligations under the agreement. And so that is the fundamental issue that we're struggling with, Your Honor, and I fully appreciate what you're saying.

We are not driving an unreasonable schedule. We have a package of support, we are cooperating fully. This is the subservicing agreement with the bank that I think everybody wants to get approved. And I don't want the Court to have any misimpression that we're anything other than good faith actors and very reasonable about all of these things, Your Honor. just trying to make the point for you, Judge, that it's really an integrated agreement. We really see it as a bank issue.

We're happy to talk to anybody. I'm talking to Mr. Eckstein tonight at 6:30. I reached out to him, I said Ken, why don't we go have coffee, get together and talk. We are not -- we are in court a lot, Your Honor. We're not the kind of shop that runs an unreasonable case. We're trying our best to do the right thing, here.

We fundamentally do see it as the bank issue and I take Your Honor's comments to heart. But I don't want you to think and I don't want to understate -- and I know Your Honor doesn't like to hear the regulatory overlay; I appreciate that. We are a bank holding company, we're a bank and I know we have to answer sometimes to parties. But we are doing everything possible -- and I just wanted to share that for Your Honor -to cooperate with the examiner, and we're meeting with him

> eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

pre-arranged plan. And that's what we signed up for.

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

tomorrow, and I don't want an unnecessary fight. I think it's

the last thing AFI or Ally Bank wants. We're trying to do the

right thing and support this company to a sale and we hope a

MR. ECKSTEIN: Your Honor, at the risk of belaboring this call, two points. First of all, I will admit that Mr. Schrock and I are going to probably have drinks and not coffee. But --

MR. SCHROCK: That's true, Your Honor.

MR. ECKSTEIN: -- more substantively, the problem, I think as Mr. Schrock understands, is that this is an integrated agreement that was crafted by AFI together with ResCap prior to the filing and presented to us sort of as a package. And unfortunately, it's going to require the Court's determination of whether or not this package was reasonable. And we don't believe it was reasonable in shifting a hundred percent of these responsibilities to ResCap. And that's simply -- and there's a substantive disagreement on that.

But with all that said, and we understand that they would like the Court to approve the agreement that they crafted, and we're either going to be able to reach a resolution or we'll have to present it to the Court and the Court will have to make -- determine whether or not this package is reasonable. And we understand as much as everybody else in this case the number of issues that are involved, and

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

39 so I would say at this point in time, Mr. Schrock and I are going to sit down. And I think we've all said that we'd like to try to see if we can reach a resolution and we will continue to try and I think we'd be happy to come back and report to the Court again next week, if that would be useful. But I think that both sides have to understand that they need to come to the table, and if there's really a desire to not litigate this issue now and to come up with a real status quo solution, then I would suggest that AFI has to understand that as much as ResCap.

This is not Ally Bank; AFI and ResCap are going to

This is not Ally Bank; AFI and ResCap are going to have to understand how to preserve the status quo if that's what the parties want to do.

MR. LEE: Your Honor, sorry; it's Gary Lee. I just want to be absolutely clear what ResCap's position is. I think that we are the ones that are alerting to the Court and the examiner to the fact that we are concerned that, as Mr. Eckstein lays out, this trial will get into far more than the four corners of the indemnity and that goes to the heart of the examiner's investigation. And that causes us some pause, number one.

And number two, what I think we were attempting to suggest was between the position that AFI has and the committee has -- because ResCap has one position and one position only: we need the subservicing agreement approved so we can,

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. consistent with our fiduciary obligations, get the highest purchase price and return to the creditors.

As to where the indemnity ultimately lies as opposed to who needs to pay the bank back, the examiner will make that determination if he is allowed to proceed with his examination. He will make that determination and he will make those facts known to the creditors when he issues his report. And what I'm simply suggesting and trying very hard to convince everybody of is that there has to be a solution in which the bank gets paid -- and I appreciate Mr. Eckstein doesn't like the notion that it's ResCap who pays it -- that everybody reserves their rights. And if necessary, AFI -- and I'm happy to volunteer -- escrows the money somewhere else. And the right solution, Your Honor, is one that nobody likes. And in this situation that might be the right solution.

But the servicing agreement needs to be approved. And that is what will provide the best value to creditors and that is, quite frankly, what we're concerned with, not what will become not just a sideshow, but a very large side show.

THE COURT: All right. Let me deal with the issues that I have to deal -- you know, I think you all ought to sit down and have a good drink with -- Mr. Eckstein, have an extra one for me. Hopefully --

MR. ECKSTEIN: Well, how about vino, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Okay. But in the meantime, Mr. O'Neill?

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

## RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 41 1 MR. O'NEILL: Yes, sir? 2 THE COURT: What documents do you require -- have you 3 requested that have not been produced, by category? Whether 4 it's the Carpenter and Brown e-mails -- lay out for me what is 5 it that you believe have not been searched for or produced so 6 far. 7 MR. O'NEILL: We believe that the Carpenter and Brown e-mail accounts have not been searched at all with respect to 8 9 our document request to Ally Bank and --10 THE COURT: Have you given search terms? MR. O'NEILL: We have not; we have not been requested 11 12 to give search terms. But we also think it's also two accounts 13 and so, therefore, it's not that onerous. But we're happy to give search terms if that will facilitate matters. 14 15 THE COURT: What time period? 16 MR. O'NEILL: My understanding is they only have them 17 going back for a period of ninety days. Well, I guess to 18 January. We've agreed to go back to January 1 of this year 19 with the debtor and I don't think we would require more of Ally 20 Bank or AFI. 21 THE COURT: Okay. What else? The Carpenter and Brown 22 e-mails, what else? 23 MR. O'NEILL: Yastine and Mackey, if those are their 24 two 30(b)(6) witnesses. Same general conditions and we're 25 happy to get them search terms. eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 42 1 THE COURT: E-mails, January 1, 2012. 2 MR. O'NEILL: Yes. 3 THE COURT: I can acknowledge that the Carpenter and Brown e-mails weren't searched. I'm not sure what the answer 4 is as to Mackey and Yastine. 5 6 MR. O'NEILL: Yastine is vague --7 MR. MCKANE: Your Honor --Excuse me; go ahead, Mr. McKane. 8 MR. O'NEILL: 9 THE COURT: McKane, go ahead. 10 MR. MCKANE: Thank you, Your Honor. We had done targeted searches of Yastine. We understand what you're 11 12 saying. Right. We will --13 THE COURT: Wait, you're going to understand what I 14 say because I'm going to give you a deadline. But, go ahead. 15 MR. MCKANE: We will conduct the e-mail searches and 16 produce any documents identified in the time period with the 17 search terms provided. 18 THE COURT: Well, let me --19 MR. MCKANE: And we will double back and do Yastine 20 and Mackey as well as Brown and Carpenter. And because we -we had done targeted searches before but we want to do this in 21 22 a comprehensive process that satisfies the committee. 23 And are you telling everyone that those THE COURT: 24 searches will be complete and the documents produced? MR. MCKANE: Your Honor, until I -- I don't have a 25 eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

terms of coming back.

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL.

sense of the volume until the search is run. That's just a

technical matter and so I think I will be able to do that, but

I will communicate it as soon as I get the information. And I

understand what the Court said earlier about Ms. Yastine in

THE COURT: Well, I'm going to put a finer point on it. E-mails of Yastine, Mackey, Carpenter and Brown shall be produced, all responsive documents shall be produced no later than 12 noon Wednesday, August 8th. With respect to Yastine and Mackey, it should be sooner than that because you've indicated you've already done a targeted search of them. So by giving you this outside deadline, don't wait until then. But I'm telling you that is the deadline. I don't care what resources you need to commit to getting these documents. That's already longer than, frankly, makes me comfortable given when the hearing is.

That is, I'm so ordering the transcript that all responsive documents in the Carpenter and Brown e-mails shall be produced on or before 12 noon August 8th and as to Yastine and Mackey -- they ought to be produced on a rolling basis, if you can. And Yastine and Mackey, please advise Mr. O'Neill what additional steps need to be taken searching those two. You've indicated as to Carpenter and Brown, that hasn't been done yet.

Mr. O'Neill, anything else that you need?

eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250
operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net

## RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 44 1 MR. O'NEILL: Your Honor, just one follow-up point. 2 And that is to the extent that we need to -- we're obviously 3 going to need to take depositions after we get the e-mails and 4 so we'll need the flexibility to take them between the 9th and 5 the 16th. And I know Your Honor's pre-trial procedures require 6 the submission of all deposition designations by the 9th. 7 guess we just need an exception from that in order to pursue 8 these additional depositions. 9 THE COURT: You'll advise what additional depositions 10 you're planning to take. 11 MR. O'NEILL: Okay. THE COURT: Obviously, I will -- if you can't take the 12 13 deposition until you have these e-mails -- look, there's 14 nothing to stop you from -- you already have some documents 15 relating to Carpenter and Brown. If you're going to go ahead 16 and -- while it would be nice to be able to get these done in 17 one sitting, you don't have to wait until everything is done. 18 MR. O'NEILL: Very well, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Any other issues about discovery, Mr. 20 O'Neill? 21 MR. O'NEILL: No, I think that's it, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: All right. I want to schedule another 23 telephone conference. You'll have to bear with me because I'm 24 taking this call from home so I'm not in the court; this is 25 being recorded by an ECRO from -- takes me a minute to get my eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. 45 1 full calendar. 2 (Pause) The next thing I'd like to do, we have a 3 THE COURT: 4 hearing scheduled for Wednesday the 8th, 2 o'clock. We're going to continue this, a status conference with respect to 5 6 this matter Wednesday the 8th at 2 o'clock. Well, first, I 7 assume, we'll take up the KEIP-KERP? 8 Yes, Your Honor. MR. LEE: 9 THE COURT: At the conclusion of that, I know there a 10 couple of other things that are on, as well, but we'll take this up. I want a full status report of where things stand at 11 12 that time. 13 Nothing anybody wants to raise today? Mr. Eckstein? 14 15 MR. ECKSTEIN: Yes, sir? 16 THE COURT: Find a solution. 17 MR. ECKSTEIN: As Your Honor knows, I am singularly 18 focused on finding a solution. 19 THE COURT: I don't mean to pick on you for that, 20 but --MR. ECKSTEIN: I understand, Your Honor. 21 That's fine. 22 I will try to do what we can and will surely try to report back 23 by the 8th. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. ECKSTEIN: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor. eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250

1	RESIDENTIAL CAPITAL, LLC, ET AL. THE COURT: We're adjourned.	46
2	(Whereupon these proceedings were concluded at 5:03 PM)	ļ
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		ļ
10		ļ
11		ļ
12		ļ
13		ļ
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net	ļ

[1]			ı
1		47	
2	INDEX		
3			
4	RULINGS		
5	Page Line		
6	E-mails of Yastine, Mackey, Carpenter and 43 7		
7	Brown shall be produced; all responsive		
8	documents shall be produced no later than 12		
9	noon Wednesday, August 8th		
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
	eScribers, LLC   (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net   www.escribers.net		

CERTIFICATION I, Penina Wolicki, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. lenina waich. PENINA WOLICKI AAERT Certified Electronic Transcriber CET\*\*D-569 eScribers 700 West 192nd Street, Suite #607 New York, NY 10040 August 2, 2012 Date: eScribers, LLC | (973) 406-2250 operations@escribers.net | www.escribers.net